IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

CRIMINAL APPLICATION No. 2657 OF 2007

Arvind Bakelal Verma ... Applicant.

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra ... Respondent.

Mr Gejendra Jadhav, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr S.S. Pednekar, APP for the State.

CORAM: V. C. DAGA,J.

DATED: 24. 08. 2007.

P.C.:-

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and the learned APP for the State.

2. Perused application and the material available on record.

3. The applicant is seeking bail in C.R.No. 84 of 2007 registered with Oshiwara Police Station for the offence under Section 489 (A), (B),(C) and (D) read with Section 120-B read with Section 34 of the I.P.C. The factual aspect mentioned in the order of the learned Sessions Judge in his order dated 9.4.2007 in B.A.No. 457 of 2007 are not in dispute. Therefore, it is not necessary to reproduce the same.

4. According to the prosecution, the machinery and equipments to manufacture of counterfeit GC notes and other articles were recovered at the instance of the Applicant under the memorandum of panchnama as mentioned below:

1. Black colour CPU with the name written in English as Navtech and colour monitor, mouse and Key board of Samsung Company of Rs. 25,000/- approximately.

2. Laser Jet 1600 Printer of HP Company of Rs. 15,000/-.

3. Scanjet 2400 Scanner of HP Company of Rs. 15,000/-.

4. Water mark of Gandhiji's picture to be used for the screen admeasuring 6" x 4" and 15" x 7" for printing middle part GC note.

5. 244 papers of Executive Bond used for the purpose of printing GC notes.

6. Waste papers after cutting GC notes and three steel scales.

7. Screen Printing stopper - 2 pieces, 1 black colour and 1 white colour cutter, three white colour tins to be used for water mark.

Two cheque books of the bank.

5. The aforesaid articles were seized under the panchnama during the preliminary investigation. Considering the incriminating material available on record, it is nothing but economic offence. If the applicant is released on bail, possibility of committing further offence cannot be ruled out.

Similarly, the possibility of applicant jumping the bail also cannot be ruled out. It will be difficult to seek his presence for trial. Under these circumstances, it is not a fit case for grant of bail. The application is, therefore, rejected.

6. Any observation made in this order shall not be construed as any finding or any expression of opinion on the merits of the case at the time of trial.

(V.C. DAGA,J.)